

<i>Interview Summary</i>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/619,988	BIRAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Alan S. Chen	Art Unit 2182	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Alan S. Chen. (3) _____

(2) Dr. Louis Herzberg. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 18 January 2006.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: independent claims.

Identification of prior art discussed: Garcia, Jr. et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants representative suggested change claim language via supplemental amendment to include a more descriptive and narrowing language in the claims. The language, supplementing the amendment received on 1/12/2006, with regard the last limitation of claim 1 and similar corresponding limitations of the remaining independent claims shall be equivalent to, "a descriptor table for storing the plurality of descriptors generated by the descriptor logic for access by the first and second data processing system, wherein the descriptor table includes the plurality of descriptors in their entirety". While Examiner agreed these changes would distinguish the instant application from the applied prior art, the Examiner would have to perform another search and thereby recommending the filing of an RCE